

**COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH ANNUAL REPORT FOR 2000-01**

No items for Senate action are included in this report.

During the academic year 2000-01, the Committee on Research (C-Res) met fourteen times, including one public meeting, to address issues related to University research policy and its implementation. The Committee took the following actions during the 2000-01 academic year:

- A. Developed a recommendation for University response to issues stemming from export controls and the International Traffic in Arms Regulation (ITAR). See Attachment A to this report.
- B. Drafted a description of fundamental principles to guide decision-making at Stanford related to distance learning. See Attachment B to this report.
- C. Responded to a request from the Economics Department as to whether proposals from Stanford faculty may be submitted through the National Bureau of Economics Research (NBER) rather than through Stanford.
- D. Advised the Provost, at his request, on issues related to PI status for members of the Medical Center Line (MCL) faculty.

In addition, the Committee discussed the following subjects, with no action taken as a result:

- A. Increased burdens related to the oversight on human subjects research, including requirements for record-keeping and training of researchers
- B. Implementation of Stanford's Faculty Policy on Conflict of Commitment and Interest (as required by that policy)
- C. Implementation of Stanford's Openness in Research policy (as required by that policy)

Each of these is discussed in greater detail in the following sections of this report.

-----  
**I. COMMITTEE ACTIONS**  
-----

- A. INTERNATIONAL TRAFFIC IN ARMS REGULATION (ITAR).

The Committee met with several individuals who have been affected by recent changes in the International Traffic in Arms Regulation (ITAR) and are working to develop a response to those changes. At issue is the evolving implementation of export control regulations on the conduct of satellite- and space-based research. These regulations directly contradict the openness in research policies of most research universities, including that of Stanford.

The Committee formulated two recommendations in this regard:

1. The academic leadership of Stanford University should work with the leaders of other academic institutions in a concerted effort to resolve the current regulatory impasse involving the application of export controls to fundamental research.
2. Stanford faculty should be further educated on the current threats to openness in research at Stanford and elsewhere, and on the importance of the principles of publishability and nondiscrimination in research.

The Committee continues to support efforts to mobilize the academic community in response to this difficult situation. (See Attachment A to this report.) Recognizing the importance of proposal and award language, the Committee recommended steps to be taken by Stanford's Office of Sponsored Research in submitting proposals and accepting awards. The Committee also prepared and distributed an "Openness in Research" checklist to alert Stanford researchers to issues related to the publication of results and the right of researchers to participate regardless of citizenship. That checklist has been provided on the Stanford web, distributed to School Deans for dissemination within their Schools, and incorporated into materials for presentation to all Stanford Principal Investigators.

#### B. FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLES TO GUIDE STANFORD DECISION-MAKING RELATED TO DISTANCE LEARNING

Policy questions related to distance learning, particularly internet-based educational ventures, are broad and complex. As the institutional "owner" of university policies on intellectual property and on faculty conflict of commitment and interest, the Committee was asked to formulate thoughts to guide decision-making in this regard.

The Committee met with several individuals involved with distance learning ventures, including the Provost and his designees in this area, and reviewed documentation from other institutions. After extensive discussion, the Committee drafted a statement of principles to guide the university in its thinking about distance learning (Attachment B to this report). The following principles are put forward as a reaffirmation of fundamental values:

"Serving the Stanford Community"

Stanford needs to define the term "student" and identify the various constituencies whom it serves. The centrality of the undergraduate and graduate students in residence at Stanford should remain in clear focus.

#### "Institutional Integrity"

Insofar as schools and departments may earn revenue from distance learning ventures, those opportunities must not inappropriately influence academic decision-making. In the same way that faculty are required to disclose their financial interests, so schools and departments should disclose their interests in potential distance learning ventures, with potential conflicts managed in the best interests of the university.

#### "Unfettered Internal Dissemination"

Materials developed by faculty and students should be available for fair use throughout the university. Any agreements with outside agencies by faculty or the university which interfere with this unfettered use within the university are inappropriate.

#### "Primary Allegiance"

Stanford faculty owe their primary professional allegiance to this university. Faculty should be careful of outside relationships that could conflict or compete with their commitment to Stanford.

#### "Stanford Name"

The university has the right and the duty to control the use of the Stanford name to ensure fair compensation for the use of the name and to assure the university's standards are not eroded.

The public meeting of the Committee on Research, held on May 14, was largely devoted to this topic (see Section IV. of this report).

### C. NATIONAL BUREAU OF ECONOMICS RESEARCH (NBER).

The National Bureau of Economics Research (NBER) is a private, nonprofit organization of academic economists with offices in Cambridge, New York, Massachusetts, and Stanford. Stanford faculty have had a working relationship with NBER since the 1970s. Occasionally Stanford PIs have submitted proposals for funding to be administered through NBER rather than through Stanford. This has been done in part to facilitate access to NBER's large, proprietary data bases related to the economics of health care.

Stanford's Faculty Policy on Conflict of Commitment and Interest prohibits Principal Investigators from submitting proposals through non-Stanford entities when that work could be done at Stanford. Such proposals are allowed if needed for access to facilities or resources not available at Stanford. Essential internal controls however must be maintained. For

example, controls on the amount of PI effort dedicated to sponsored projects, the use of human or animal subjects in research, potential conflicts of interest, and publishability of results must be assured.

The Committee advised that, if proposals are to be submitted through NBER, an explanation as to why that is necessary should be forwarded to Stanford's Office of Sponsored Research. OSR must maintain documentation on those projects to assure compliance with regulations and policy.

**D. PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR PRIVILEGES FOR MEDICAL CENTER LINE FACULTY**

The Provost requested the advice of the Committee on Research in regard to questions about PI privileges for the Medical Center Line (MCL) faculty. Over the decade since the establishment of the MCL, the numbers of MCL faculty have dramatically increased while their role and expectations for research participation have also expanded.

Stanford's policy on PI eligibility limits PIship to members of the Academic Council. MCL faculty are not members of the Academic Council, and therefore may not be PIs without an approved exception to this policy. The School of Medicine is authorized to grant such approvals, and currently has a process in place for "blanket approvals" for PI waivers for MCL faculty engaged in clinical research.

As MCL faculty have grown both in numbers and in their contribution to the School of Medicine, the need to request approval for PI status has become a significant irritant. The Committee on Research endorses continued analysis of the role of the professoriate related to the mission of the School of Medicine. In particular, the roles and expectations for clinical faculty need to be better understood. The Committee recommends that this analysis be carried out within the School of Medicine, with the cooperation of the Dean of Research Office. This analysis needs to inform consideration of larger questions than PI eligibility. The Committee expects that this analysis may lead to a wider review within the university community of the role of clinical faculty, and how that role affects the rest of the university.

-----  
**III. COMMITTEE REPORT AND DISCUSSION ITEMS**  
-----

**A. ADMINISTRATIVE BURDEN OF RESEARCH COMPLIANCE**

As the number of projects involving human subjects (in both medical and nonmedical research) has increased, so has the burden on the panels to provide effective oversight and protection of subjects. Stanford's Administrative Panels provide this oversight. They include members of the faculty and staff, along with individuals from the community.

Sponsors and regulatory agencies are carefully scrutinizing institutional controls on the protection of research subjects. The amount of time and record-keeping associated with these requirements is growing.

Beginning in October, 2000, the National Institutes of Health required that all investigators submitting NIH applications or receiving new or non-competing awards for research involving human subjects complete an educational program on the protection of human research participants. Stanford addressed this requirement with a mandatory web tutorial and an associated data base of "trainees."

Other regulatory requirements for training in "the responsible conduct of research" were also promulgated by federal agencies last year, and subsequently rescinded pending further review.

The Committee feels that, while promoting and maintaining compliance with regulations, Stanford should act as a partner with the faculty and provide helpful tools in this regard.

**B. IMPLEMENTATION OF FACULTY POLICY ON CONFLICT OF COMMITMENT AND INTEREST**

As required by the Faculty Policy on Conflict of Commitment and Interest, the Dean of Research reported to the Committee on the implementation of that policy. The Dean reported that the policy appears to be working effectively. During the summer of 2001, the Dean of Research office plans to visit with each of the Schools to look more closely at implementation issues.

**C. IMPLEMENTATION OF OPENNESS IN RESEARCH POLICY**

As required, the Committee presented Stanford's Openness in Research policy at its public meeting. Stanford's commitment to freedom of access by all interested persons to the underlying data, processes, and results of research was reconfirmed at this meeting.

-----  
**IV. PUBLIC MEETING**  
-----

The annual public meeting of the Committee on Research was held on May 14, 2002 in Room 101 of the Packard Electrical Engineering Building. In addition to Committee members, approximately 50 other guests attended.

After presenting an overview of Stanford's Openness in Research policy, the remainder of the meeting was devoted to a series of presentations on topics related to distance learning. The following were the presenters and topics:

- Paul Marca, Director of Professional Education/Business Development Stanford Center for Professional Development (SCPD), described the

evolution and current activities of the SCPD in transmitting Stanford courses via two-way video and via the internet.

- Brian Cantwell, Professor, Aeronautical/Astronautical Engineering, described his experience as an instructor in a distance learning class
- Sam Steinhardt, Chief Financial and Operations Officer of Stanford's Learning Technology and Extended Education (LTEE) organization, described recent initiatives to explore web-based ventures for distance learning.
- John Perry, Professor, Philosophy, presented the five underlying principles which the Committee felt should guide our activities in this regard. (See Section 1.B. of this report.)

Overall, those present were in favor of continuing to explore distance learning opportunities, while preserving the important principles enumerated by Professor Perry on behalf of the Committee.

The Stanford Report published two articles about the Committee's public meeting. These are provided as Attachments C and D to these minutes.

-----  
**V. MEMBERSHIP OF THE 2000-01 COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH**  
 -----

David Leith (SLAC), Chair  
 Samuel Abrams (Undergraduate student member, Public Policy)  
 Tareq Al-Naffouri (Graduate student member, Electrical Engineering)  
 Brian Cantwell (Aeronautical/Astronautical Engineering)  
 Britt Hedman (Academic Staff, Chemistry/SSRL)  
 James Leckie (Civil Engineering)  
 John Perry (Philosophy/CSLI)  
 Michael Moseley (Radiology)  
 Margaret Neale (Graduate School of Business)  
 Amado Padilla (Education)  
 Gal Raz (Graduate student member, GSB)  
 Anthony Slavin (Postdoctoral Scholar, Immunology & Rheumatology)

Ex officio:

Charles Kruger, Vice Provost and Dean of Research and Graduate Policy  
 Ed Mocarski, Associate Dean of Research \*  
 Ann Arvin, Associate Dean of Research \*

- \* Ed Mocarski left the Associate Dean of Research position in January 2001. Professor Ann Arvin was appointed Associate Dean of Research, and served as an ex officio member of the Committee from that point.

Staff:

Ann George, Assistant Dean of Research

## School representatives:

John Brauman, School of Humanities and Sciences  
Harry Greenberg, School of Medicine \*\*  
Jeff Koseff, School of Engineering

\*\* Harry Greenberg took a leave of absence from Stanford University during this year and was not replaced as a school representative on the Committee.

## Other regularly-invited guests:

Tom Fenner, General Counsel Office  
Katharine Ku, Office of Technology Licensing  
Geoff Grant, Office of Research Administration

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- A. Letter from the Committee on Research to the Chair of the Academic Senate Steering Committee, March 1, 2001, on the subject of ITAR and openness in research
- B. Institutional Approaches to Distance learning: Affirmation of Principles DRAFT, April 17, 2001
- C. *Stanford Report*, "Community invited to meeting on distance learning," May 9, 2001
- D. *Stanford Report*, " University trading carefully as it considers approaches to distance learning," May 16, 2001

*For a copy of  
attachments contact*

*Priscilla Johnson  
Academic Secretary's Office  
650-723-1747*

*[priscilla.johnson@stanford.edu](mailto:priscilla.johnson@stanford.edu)*